



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Prophetarum Vitae Fabulosae Indices Apostolorum Discipulorumque Domini Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto Aliisque Vindicata. Edidit THEODORUS SCHERMANN. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907. Pp. lxxi+255. M. 5.60.

The two parts of this work, the lives of the prophets and the catalogues of the apostles and disciples, though otherwise unconnected, are published together here only because they are either handed down under the names of the same authors, or are found together in the same manuscripts. Both, moreover, had their home in Syria.

Schermann thinks that the source of the fabulous lives of the prophets was a Greek document—a translation perhaps of a Hebrew original—written by a Jew some time between 150 B. C. and 150 A. D. and containing only biographical and legendary statements. Afterward Christian authors added Messianic prophecies similar to the Christian interpolations in the *Lives of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Of the six recensions of the Greek text which he distinguishes, the oldest is an anonymous work derived ultimately from Origen. Next comes the text of Dorotheus, presbyter of Antioch (290 A. D.), not the bishop of Tyre, in which the Messianic prophecies being put first as prefaces in the case of the minor prophets leave the lives that follow free from Christian additions, and so in this text alone is preserved “the pure biographical form of the original.” It remains to mention two closely related recensions of the pseudo-Epiphanius of the sixth century, then the so-called scholia-recension of the same age, and finally one preserved in the Greek menologies and synaxaria, not published here because it is a mixture of the others.

The second part of the book contains (1) the legendary catalogues of the apostles, showing where they preached, how they died and where they lie buried, and (2) the lists of the seventy disciples. They are handed down to us in two groups of texts, Syriac and Greek, from a common Syriac source. The Greek recensions date from the sixth to the twelfth century, the oldest having been discovered by Schermann in the Vatican. Others are falsely ascribed to Epiphanius, Dorotheus, Hippolytus, and Symeon Logothetes. The whole subject is fully and satisfactorily discussed by our author in his recent work *Propheten- und Apostellegenden* in volume 31 of Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*.

CHARLES W. PEPPLER

EMORY COLLEGE

T. LUCRETI CARL. *De rerum natura*. Edited by WILLIAM AUGUSTUS MERRILL. American Book Company. Pp. 806.

Editors and teachers of Lucretius will always emphasize that aspect of the *De rerum natura*, philological, literary, or philosophical, that inter-

ests them most. A glance at Professor Merrill's edition shows that he is more interested in the accumulation of philological detail than in illuminating literary criticism or the study of the relation of the poet's thought to his sources. This once noted, it is the part of fair criticism to judge the book by what it does rather than by what it does not offer. While serviceable in the class-room, it will be especially useful for consultation by the more advanced students of the seminar of which it is evidently a product. It is very full and conscientious in the citation of the "literature" and presents an enormous amount of statistical observation of Lucretian usage from papers published and unpublished. The structure of the hexameter in particular has been closely studied, and many interesting details are noted. There is, perhaps, a tendency to schoolmaster the poet, and some noble if rugged lines are censured because they do not conform to Virgilian or Ovidian norms. Questions of text criticism are not relegated to an appendix, but abundantly treated in the exegetical notes. There are some misprints: notably Enoanda for Oenoanda *passim*. The 56 pages of introduction discuss the usual topics with copious footnotes and references to the literature.

It is impossible to enter upon this detail here, and the mere expression of occasional dissent would be useless. Even when we cannot accept Professor Merrill's interpretations he usually spreads before us the material for a dissenting opinion. The essential references to the Greek philosophic sources as indicated by Munro, Woltjer, and Giussani are generally given, if sometimes in a somewhat perfunctory fashion. But in a work of so much labor we might perhaps look for more illustration from the Greek than we find. To take a few instances at random: the use of *fundere* (1. 351, etc.) recalls Empedocles' χεῖρ' ἔθνεα μυρία θνητῶν; *quo referentes* (1. 424, etc.) is Epicurus' ἐφ' ὃ ἀνάξομεν (D. L. x. 38) or his ἀναφέροντα (x. 63); *adhibere* (1. 828, etc.) is προσφέρεισθαι (D. L. x. 54); *latrare* (2. 17) is βοᾶν; *nil agere tot corpora materiai* (2. 1057) suggests ἀργὴν ὕλην; *limus* and *faex* (5. 496, 497) attempt to reproduce the Greek ἰλὺς and ὑποστάμη; *quasi conspurcare* (6. 22) is probably ῥυπαίνειν; the unique use of *penetrabat eos* (5. 1262) may be "vulgar Latin," but it looks like an attempt to render εἰσῆγε or εἰσῆλθεν αὐτοῖς or an equivalent; *stili-cidi casus lapidem cavat* (1. 313) suggests Choerilus fr. 9 πέτρην κοιλαίνει and other Greek parallels; the point in 1. 465 *cum dicunt esse* would be made more clear by citation of Plato *Tim.* 38 A-B and Plutarch *Moral.* 1116 B; at 1. 830 it should be noted that Plato *Protag.* 329 D nearly if not quite proves that ὁμοιομερής and all its paronyms are later than Plato; 1. 446, 447 should be glossed by οὐτ' αἰσθητὸν οὔτε νοητόν; *montivagae ferai* 1. 404 may be illustrated by θῆρ' ὀρειβάτην (Soph. *Phil.* 955) and similar expressions; *dias in luminis oras* when used of birth recalls Pindar's θατηὰν ἐς αἴγλαν in a like connection (*Nem.* 1. 35); the use of *corpora deponunt* for *se* 1. 258 is paralleled by Pindar's use of δέμας (*O.* 1. 20).

Fortuna gubernans (5. 107) has many Greek parallels from Menander to *Anth. Pal.* x. 65.

These suggestions are offered with no captious intention. Professor Merrill has packed his 800 pages with information, and it only remains to thank him for what he has given us.

PAUL SHOREY

L. Annaei Senecae opera quae supersunt. Volumen II. L. Annaei Senecae Naturalium Quaestionum libros viii edidit ALFRED GERCKE. Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1907. Pp. xlvii + 278. M. 3.60.

While a new critical edition of all the prose writings of the philosopher Seneca was greatly needed, this was conspicuously true of the *Naturales Quaestiones* on account of the extreme corruption of the text. The edition by Gercke should be welcomed as a valuable aid in the study of one of the interesting chapters in the history of science. The chief value of this edition lies in the information which the preface and the critical apparatus give concerning the manuscripts.

After treating briefly of the time of composition and the division of the work, the editor discusses the order of the eight books. Definite references of Seneca to the order in which different parts of the subject are presented make it probable that Book iii was written before *iv a*, *iv b* before ii, v before vi, vii before i. The attempt, however, to show that the order of the whole was iii, *iv a*; *iv b*, ii, v, vi; vii, i, is far from convincing. It is maintained as certain—and this is the corner-stone of the argument—that the preface of Book iii was the introduction to the whole work. And yet the words of Seneca, if properly interpreted, are just as appropriate an introduction to the third book as to the first. The *fundamenta* of which he speaks refer to his whole work and not to the first part of it. This preface has also been misinterpreted by being put in part into the mouth of Lucilius. The view that 6, 8, 3 and 2, 59, 5 were written after *iv a*, and that 1, 2, 3 was written after 2, 26, 9, and i praef. 13 after 2, 45, 3, rests upon a strained interpretation of the passages compared. In 2, 1, 4, Seneca is speaking of the parts of physical science in general, not of the parts of his own work. The editor, however, is so certain of the correctness of his views that he is not satisfied with presenting them in the preface but renumbers the books in the text. The order of the books is again discussed in the section on their subscriptions and publication, the change from the original order to the present one being ascribed to Seneca himself. But if this is the order in which the author wished the books published, what propriety is there in renumbering them in their published form?

The remainder of the preface is devoted to the history of the work